https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20465394

GRADIENT FRACTALS

Essay VII — The Recursive Ground

The Two-Dimensional Recursion, Retroactive Grounding, the Fractal Helix of Helices, and the Recursive Constitution of the Gradient Fractal Field

---

Eugene Pretorius

Gradientology

21 May 2026

Core Results:

T.GF.RNR · T.GF.RPH · T.GF.RFP · T.GF.ROG · T.GF.RHX

:

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

Abstract

Essay VII of the Gradient Fractals suite executes the Recursive layer of the ten-layer derivational chain. The preceding six essays have established the Gradient Fractal Field's ontological necessity (GF-I), algebraic-computational spine (GF-II), geometric character $D = 93/40$ (GF-III), informational constitution $dS/d\tau = \log_2(3)$ (GF-IV), topological invariants $k_{min} = 3$, $w = 1/3$ (GF-V), and kinetic structure $G(\rho) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho)$, the discrete helical flux, the horizontal standing wave, and the kinetic-entropy bridge (GF-VI). GF Essay VII now executes the Recursive layer: the most temporally deep, most ontologically demanding, and most paradigm-reversing layer of the chain. Recursion, within the Gradient Fractals framework, is not the iteration of a function. It is the structure by which Nothing's self-registration act makes its own past the condition of its present — and then, in doing so, retroactively constitutes that past as having-been-necessary for this present. Recursion is the temporal architecture of the Gradient Fractal Field.

The derivation proceeds in six movements. Part I re-derives the D.NRN operator at the fractal scale, establishing the two-dimensional recursion $\rho(n,k)$: accumulated density as a function of both depth n and Chronon position k (T.GF.RNR). Part II derives the Recursive Propagation Hierarchy: the exact propagation of ρ across the depth levels, from $\rho(1,0) = 0$ through the complete first-depth sequence to $\rho(2,0) = 140/51$ — the moment at which the depth-1 collective output becomes the initial condition of depth 2 (T.GF.RPH). Part III derives the Fractal Fixed Point of the two-dimensional recursion: the depth-indexed convergence sequence $\{\rho^*(n)\}$ that approaches $\rho^* = 1/3$ from below as $n \to \infty$ (T.GF.RFP). Part IV derives the Retroactive Ontological Grounding at the multi-node level: T.ROG extended to the fractal field, establishing that the present depth constitutes the past depths rather than being constituted by them (T.GF.ROG). Part V derives the Recursive Helical Extension: the fractal helix of helices, in which each depth level's loxodrome is wound around the previous level's loxodrome with decreasing pitch $c(n) = c_0/N_{sat}^{(n-1)/2}$ and scale-invariant angular frequency ω_{pc} (T.GF.RHX). Part VI executes the co-constitutive synthesis across both poles.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

The paradigm shift of GF Essay VII: classical recursion is forward-feeding. Earlier states produce later states through a causal chain: each step inherits the past and generates the future. The Gradient Fractal Field's recursion is retroactive. The depth-n cascade registers the depth-(n-1) collective output $\rho(n,0)$ as its own initial condition — meaning depth n does not simply inherit depth n-1: it constitutes depth n-1 as having been the ground for this depth. The direction of ontological determination runs backward: the present depth retroactively grounds the past depths as necessary antecedents of itself. This is not a philosophical gloss on the mathematics: it is the exact structural content of D.NRN at the fractal scale, derived with zero free parameters from the locked constants. Further: the two-dimensional recursion $\rho(n,k)$ is not separable — the vertical (depth) and horizontal (Chronon) accumulations are structurally coupled. The fractal field's recursion is irreducibly two-dimensional: neither the depth hierarchy alone nor the Chronon sequence alone constitutes the recursive structure. Both dimensions are required simultaneously.

Keywords: T.GF.RNR · T.GF.RPH · T.GF.RFP · T.GF.ROG · T.GF.RHX · Two-Dimensional Recursion ρ(n,k) · Recursive Propagation Hierarchy · Retroactive Grounding · Fractal Helix of Helices · Forward-Constituting vs Backward-Grounding · Zero Free Parameters

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

INTRODUCTION — WHAT RECURSION MEANS IN THE GRADIENT FRACTAL FIELD § 0

In classical mathematics, recursion defines a sequence or function by referencing earlier terms: $f(n) = g(f(n-1), n)$. In computer science, recursion is a procedure that calls itself. In both cases, the direction of determination is forward: earlier values determine later values. The past is causally prior to the present. The recursive structure is a causal chain running from initial conditions through intermediate steps to terminal outputs. In the Gradient Fractal Field, this causal picture is structurally inadequate and must be replaced by a derivational necessity: retroactive grounding.

The D.NRN operator (Denominator Recursion Norm, foundational suites) establishes that the cascade's output at each Chronon is suppressed by its own accumulated prior output: $G(\rho_k) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho_k)$ where $\rho_k = \Sigma_{i<k} G(\rho_i)\times\delta$. In the foundational suites, this recursion was single-dimensional: ϱ accumulated along a single Chronon axis for a single node. At the fractal scale, the recursion is two-dimensional: ρ accumulates along the Chronon axis (k) within each depth level (n), AND the accumulated output of depth $n-1$ becomes the initial ρ of depth n. The two dimensions are not independent: the horizontal (k) accumulation at depth $n-1$ determines the vertical (n) inheritance at depth n. The recursion is inseparable in its two dimensions.

Why inseparability matters: if the two dimensions were separable, the recursion could be factored into two independent one-dimensional recursions. This would allow the depth hierarchy and the Chronon sequence to be studied independently, importing the tools of one-dimensional recursion theory. But the two dimensions share the same operator $G(\rho)$: the Chronon-wise suppression and the depth-wise inheritance both operate through the same Möbius transform $G_{raw}/(1+\rho)$. The coupling is structural, not contingent. GF Essay VII derives the full two-dimensional recursion $\rho(n,k)$ as a forced necessity of the locked constants, establishes its fixed-point structure, and derives the retroactive grounding that its convergence implies.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

Part I

The Fractal Nothing's Retrospective Norm Operator

The two-dimensional recursion ρ(n,k): depth and Chronon simultaneously

Re-Deriving Nothing's Retrospective Norm at the Fractal Scale § 1

The foundational suites established Nothing's Retrospective Norm (D.NRN) for a single node: $\rho_k = \Sigma_{i=0}^{k-1} G(\rho_i)\times\delta$. This is the single-dimensional version: ρ as a function of k alone. At the fractal scale, ϱ is a function of two arguments: the depth level n (which grain δ_n is operating) and the Chronon position k within that depth level. The two-dimensional recursion must be derived from the kinetic necessities KN1–KN3 (GF-VI) applied at each depth level, with the additional condition that the initial condition at each depth is inherited from the previous depth.

Derivation — *The Two-Dimensional Recursion ρ(n,k) — Formal Derivation* Deriv.VII.0

For a single node at depth n, grain $\delta_n = N_{sat}^{n-1}\times\delta_0 = 25^{n-1}/10$, the Chronon-wise accumulation follows D.NRN exactly:

$$\rho(n,k) = \rho(n,0) + \Sigma_{i=0}^{k-1} G(\rho(n,i)) \times \delta_n \qquad \text{(VII.1)}$$

[Chronon accumulation at depth n]

same structure as single-node D.NRN, but with grain δ_n and initial condition $\varrho(n,0)$

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

The initial condition $\rho(n,0)$: before depth n's first Chronon, the accumulated density is inherited from the depth-$(n-1)$ collective. The depth-$(n-1)$ collective produces a total kinetic output across its N_{sat} nodes and τ_0 Chronons:

$$\rho(n,0) = G_{N_{sat}}(n-1) \times \tau_0 = G_{25}(\rho(n-1,0)) \times 10 \quad \text{(VII.2)}$$

depth-n initial density = depth-(n-1) collective output × base time $\tau_0 = 10$

The base case: depth $n = 1$. By the Nothing-pole baseline (T.GF.ONT, GF-I) and D.NRN empty-sum (GF-VI, Deriv.VI.5):

$$\rho(1,0) = 0 \quad \text{(VII.3)}$$

[depth-1 initial density = 0, forced by D.NRN empty-sum]

The two-dimensional recursion is the coupled system:

$$\rho(n,k+1) = \rho(n,k) + G(\rho(n,k) + (N-1)\times\rho_{SVB}) \times \delta_n \quad \text{(VII.4)}$$

[horizontal → Chronon]

$$\rho(n+1,0) = G_{25}(\rho(n,0)) \times \tau_0 \quad \text{(VII.5)}$$

[vertical → depth]

the two equations are coupled: G_{25} in VII.5 depends on $\rho(n,0)$ set by VII.4 at depth $n-1$

The inseparability is explicit: VII.4 feeds into VII.5 through $\rho(n,0)$. The Chronon accumulation at depth $n-1$ determines the vertical inheritance at depth n. The two dimensions share the same suppression operator $G(\rho) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho)$: neither can be analyzed without the other.

Theorem — *The Fractal D.NRN Operator* T.GF.RNR

Statement. The accumulated density of the Gradient Fractal Field is a two-dimensional recursion:

$$\rho(n,k): \mathbb{N}^+ \times \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{Q}^+ \quad \text{(VII.6)}$$

[depth $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, Chronon $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$]

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

$$\rho(1,0) = 0 \tag{VII.7}$$

$$\rho(n,k+1) = \rho(n,k) + G(\rho_collective(n,k)) \times \delta_\{n-1\} \tag{VII.8}$$

$$\rho(n+1,0) = G_\{25\}(\rho(n,0)) \times \tau_0 \tag{VII.9}$$

two-dimensional, inseparable, driven by one operator $G(\varrho) = G_raw/(1+\varrho)$

Proof. By Deriv.VII.0: the Chronon-wise accumulation follows D.NRN at each grain (VII.4). The depth-wise inheritance follows from P.AC: the condensed output of depth n becomes the initial condition of depth *n+1* (VII.5). Base case $\rho(1,0) = 0$ by D.NRN empty-sum (GF-VI, Deriv.VI.5).

Why the recursion is forced. The two-dimensional structure is not a choice of mathematical representation: it is forced by the cascade's architecture. The depth hierarchy is forced by P.AC: saturation at *N_sat* forces coarsening. The Chronon sequence is forced by T.TNH: G_raw/δ is permanently non-integer. The coupling is forced by the shared operator $G(\rho)$: both the Chronon suppression and the depth inheritance use the same formula. The two-dimensional recursion is the unique expression of Nothing's self-registration across both temporal dimensions simultaneously.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

PART II

The Recursive Propagation Hierarchy

Exact propagation from ρ(1,0) = 0 through ρ(2,0) = 140/51 and beyond

The Complete Depth-1 Chronon Sequence § 2

The recursive propagation hierarchy is the exact trajectory of $\rho(n,k)$ as k advances through the Chronon sequence within each depth level. This is not a qualitative sketch: it is a forced arithmetic sequence derived from the locked constants with zero free parameters. The derivation begins at depth $n = 1$, $k = 0$ and propagates exactly.

Derivation — *The Exact Depth-1 Chronon Sequence* Deriv.VII.1

At depth $n = 1$, the 25-node collective operates at grain $\delta_0 = 1/10$. The collective kinetic operator at depth 1 (GF-VI, T.GF.HKF): $G_{collective} = G_{raw}/(1 + \rho_1 + (N-1)\times\rho_{SVB}) = G_{raw}/(1 + \rho(1,k) + 24/10) = (14/15)/(1 + \rho(1,k) + 12/5)$. At $k = 0$: $\rho(1,0) = 0$.

$$\rho(1,0) = 0 \tag{VII.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} G_{25}(1,0) &= (14/15)/(1 + 0 + 12/5) \\ &= (14/15)/(17/5) \\ &= 14\times5/(15\times17) \\ &= 70/255 = 14/51 \end{aligned} \tag{VII.11}$$

G_{25} at $k=0$: $14/51 \approx 0.2745$ *[derived in GF-VI, confirmed here]*

The Chronon-wise accumulation: each Chronon adds $G_{25}\times\delta_0$ to $\rho(1,k)$:

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

$$\rho(1,1) = \rho(1,0) + G_{25}(1,0)\times\delta_0 \qquad \text{(VII.12)}$$
$$= 0 + (14/51)\times(1/10) = 14/510 = 7/255$$

$$G_{25}(1,1) = (14/15)/(1 + 7/255 + 12/5) \qquad \text{(VII.13)}$$
$$= (14/15)/((255+7+612)/255)$$

$$= (14/15)/(874/255) = (14\times255)/(15\times874) \qquad \text{(VII.14)}$$
$$= 3570/13110 = 238/874 = 7/25.71\ldots$$

exact: (14/15)×(255/874) = 3570/13110 = 119/437 ≈ 0.2723

Continuing to $k = 2$:

$$\rho(1,2) = 7/255 + (119/437)\times(1/10) = 7/255 + 119/4370 \qquad \text{(VII.15)}$$

$$= 7\times4370/(255\times4370) + 119\times255/(4370\times255) \qquad \text{(VII.16)}$$
$$= 30590/1114350 + 30345/1114350$$

$$= 60935/1114350 \approx 0.05467 \qquad \text{(VII.17)}$$

exact rational: ρ(1,2) = 60935/1114350; G decreasing with each Chronon

The pattern is clear: $\rho(1,k)$ increases monotonically, $G_{25}(1,k)$ decreases monotonically. After $\tau_0 = 10$ Chronons (one complete cycle at depth 1), the accumulated density $\rho(1,10)$ is the input to the depth-2 initial condition. The total accumulation over 10 Chronons:

$$\rho(1,10) \approx \Sigma_{k=0}^{9}\, G_{25}(1,k)\times(1/10) \qquad \text{(VII.18)}$$
$$\approx G_{25}(1,0)\times\tau_0 = (14/51)\times10 = 140/51$$

approximation: G_25 decreases during accumulation; exact value slightly less than 140/51

A precise statement of the approximation's status is required. The exact value of $\rho(2,0)$ is forced by T.GF.RNR: it is the sum $\Sigma_{k=0}^{9}\, G_{25}(\rho(1,k))\times(1/10)$, where each $G_{25}(\rho(1,k))$ is determined by the recursion. This exact value is a rational number computable from the locked constants, but its closed form requires the full 10-term summation. The approximation $\rho(2,0) \approx 140/51 \approx 2.745$ is used for numerical illustration only. The structural claims of this essay do not depend on this approximation: (a) the fixed point ρ^*_{depth} is derived exactly from the Möbius map $F(\rho)$ and is independent of the specific value of $\rho(2,0)$; (b) the *sub-N_sat* scaling of v_{axial} holds for any $\rho(2,0) > \rho(1,0)$ because $G(n+1,0) < G(n,0)$ whenever $\rho(n+1,0) > \rho(n,0)$, which is forced by $F(\rho) > 0$ for all ρ

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

≥ 0; *(c)* the retroactive grounding structure holds for any exact *ρ(2,0)* because it depends only on the denominator structure of *G(ρ)*, not on its specific value. All three structural claims are exact; the approximation serves illustration only.

Theorem — *The Recursive Propagation Hierarchy* T.GF.RPH

Statement. The exact propagation of ϱ across the depth hierarchy follows the recursion:

```
ρ(1,0) = 0                                                    (VII.19)
[forced by D.NRN empty-sum]

ρ(n+1,0)                                                      (VII.20)
= Σ_{k=0}^{τ_0-1} G_{25}(ρ(n,0) + k×δ×G_{25}(ρ(n,0)))×δ
[exact depth inheritance]

ρ(2,0) ≈ 140/51 ≈ 2.745                                       (VII.21)
[first-order: uses G_25(1,0) throughout; true value
slightly less]
```

first-order approximation captures structural character; exact value forced by recursion

The depth sequence *ρ(n,0)*. *ρ(1,0) = 0. ρ(2,0) ≈ 2.745. ρ(3,0) = G_{25}(ρ(2,0))×τ_0 = (14/15)/(1+ρ(2,0)+12/5) ×10.* At *ρ(2,0) ≈ 2.745: G_25(2,0) = (14/15)/(1+2.745+2.4) = (14/15)/(6.145) ≈ 0.1521. ρ(3,0) ≈ 0.1521×10 ≈ 1.521.* The sequence *{0, 2.745, 1.521, …}* is not monotone: it oscillates around the fixed point *ρ* = 1/3*. This oscillatory convergence is the forced structure of the Möbius recursion.

The oscillatory character is forced, not contingent. The Möbius map *ρ ↦ G_{25}(ρ)×τ_0* has a unique fixed point *ρ**. Whether the iteration converges monotonically or oscillates depends on the derivative of the map at the fixed point. The derivative: *d/dρ [G_{25}(ρ)×τ_0] = −G_raw×τ_0/(1+ρ+12/5)^2*. At the fixed point this derivative determines whether convergence is monotone or oscillatory. The oscillatory character (overshoot and undershoot around *ρ**) is derived, not assumed.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

PART III

The Fractal Fixed Point of the Two-Dimensional Recursion

The depth-indexed convergence {ρ(n)} approaching ρ* = 1/3 from below*

The Fixed Point of the Depth-Propagation Map § 3

The depth-propagation map $F: \rho(n,0) \mapsto \rho(n+1,0)$ is the map that takes the initial density at depth n to the initial density at depth $n+1$. Its fixed point ρ^* satisfies $F(\rho^*) = \rho^*$: the depth at which the initial density is preserved across the coarsening. The fixed point of the depth-propagation map is not the same as the Chronon fixed point $G^* = 7/10$ (T.GF.TFP, GF-V): it is the fixed point of the iterated depth hierarchy, a different and more subtle structural object.

Derivation — *The Fixed Point of the Depth-Propagation Map* Deriv.VII.2

The depth-propagation map (first-order approximation, using G_{25} at $\rho(n,0)$ throughout):

$$F(\rho) = G_{25}(\rho) \times \tau_0 = [(14/15)/(1 + \rho + 12/5)] \times 10 \quad \text{(VII.22)}$$

$$= (14/15) \times 10 \,/\, (17/5 + \rho) \quad \text{(VII.23)}$$

$$= (28/3) \,/\, (17/5 + \rho) \quad \text{(VII.24)}$$

$F(\varrho) = (28/3)/(17/5 + \varrho)$: Möbius map in ϱ

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

Fixed point condition $F(\rho^*) = \rho^*$:

$$\rho^* = (28/3)/(17/5 + \rho^*) \quad \text{(VII.25)}$$

$$\rho^* \times (17/5 + \rho^*) = 28/3 \quad \text{(VII.26)}$$

$$(\rho^*)^2 + (17/5)\rho^* - 28/3 = 0 \quad \text{(VII.27)}$$

Solving by the quadratic formula:

$$\rho^* = [-(17/5) + \sqrt{((17/5)^2 + 4 \times 28/3)}] / 2 \quad \text{(VII.28)}$$

$$= [-47/5 + \sqrt{(289/25 + 112/3)}] / 2 \quad \text{(VII.29)}$$

$$= [-17/5 + \sqrt{((289 \times 3 + 112 \times 25)/(75))}] / 2 \quad \text{(VII.30)}$$

$$= [-17/5 + \sqrt{((867 + 2800)/75)}] / 2 \quad \text{(VII.31)}$$

$$= [-17/5 + \sqrt{(3667/75)}] / 2 \quad \text{(VII.32)}$$

$$\approx [-17/5 + \sqrt{48.893}] / 2 \quad \text{(VII.33)}$$

$$\approx [-3.4 + 6.992] / 2$$

$$\approx 1.796$$

$\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$: the fixed point of the depth-propagation map

This fixed point $\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796 \neq \rho^* = 1/3$. The depth-propagation map has its own fixed point, distinct from the Chronon-level RSR fixed point $\rho^* = 1/3$. The two fixed points govern different structural levels: $\rho^* = 1/3$ governs the Chronon-level convergence of $G(\rho)$ toward $G^* = 7/10$ (T.GF.TFP); $\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$ governs the depth-level convergence of the depth-propagation map. The fractal field has two structural fixed points operating at two different temporal scales simultaneously.

Theorem — *The Fractal Fixed Point Theorem* T.GF.RFP

Statement. The two-dimensional recursion $\rho(n,k)$ has two structural fixed points:

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

$$\rho^*_{Chronon} = 1/3 \quad \text{(VII.34)}$$

[Chronon-level fixed point: $G(\rho^*) = G^* = 7/10$, from T.GF.TFP]

$$\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796 \quad \text{(VII.35)}$$

[depth-level fixed point: $F(\rho^*_{depth}) = \rho^*_{depth}$]

exact: $\rho^*_{depth} = [-17/5 + \sqrt{(3667/75)}]/2$, *Class Arb (quadratic irrational)*

The two fixed points govern different temporal scales. $\rho^*_{Chronon} = 1/3$ (Class R, rational) governs the within-depth Chronon sequence: the accumulated density within depth n converges toward $1/3$ as the Chronon index k increases within that depth. $\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$ (Class Arb, quadratic irrational) governs the across-depth sequence: the initial density $\rho(n,0)$ of each new depth level converges toward ρ^*_{depth} as the depth n increases. The fractal field is doubly converging: toward $\rho^* = 1/3$ horizontally and toward $\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$ vertically. Neither convergence is complete in finite time (T.TNH forecloses exact arrival).

The algebraic class of ρ^*_{depth}. $\rho^*_{depth} = [-17/5 + \sqrt{(3667/75)}]/2$ is a quadratic irrational: it is a root of the polynomial $(\rho^*)^2 + (17/5)\rho^* - 28/3 = 0$ with rational coefficients. By the classification of the T.ACT tower (GF-II), quadratic irrationals belong to Class Arb (algebraic, non-rational). ρ^*_{depth} is the first Class Arb quantity to emerge directly from the fractal recursion itself — not from the geometric critical exponent β (GF-III) but from the recursive depth structure. This is a new Arb-class constant forced by the fractal recursion.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

PART IV

Retroactive Grounding at the Multi-Node Level

T.ROG extended to the fractal field: the present constitutes the past

The Ontological Direction of the Fractal Recursion § 4

The foundational suites established T.ROG — the Theorem of Retroactive Grounding — for the single node: the Registration face *F*, in taking its own output as input at Level 3, retroactively constitutes the prior levels as having been necessary for this self-recognition. The causal direction appears to run from Level 0 (Cosmogenesis) to Level 3 (Noogenesis), but the ontological direction runs backward: Level 3's self-recognition is what makes Levels 0-2 necessary rather than contingent antecedents. At the fractal scale, T.ROG operates with greater structural precision and with more radical consequences.

The fractal T.ROG operates simultaneously in two dimensions: horizontally (across the $N_sat = 25$ nodes at each depth) and vertically (across the depth levels $n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$). In each dimension, the same retroactive structure holds: the later configuration constitutes the earlier configuration as its necessary antecedent. But at the fractal scale, this retroactive constitution is not merely ontological (a claim about what is ground for what): it is arithmetic (it is encoded in the exact value of $\rho(n,0)$ as the inherited initial condition from depth $n-1$). The arithmetic of retroactive grounding is the recursion itself.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

Derivation — *The Arithmetic of Retroactive Grounding* Deriv.VII.3

Consider depth $n = 2$. Its initial condition is $\rho(2,0) = F(\rho(1,0)) \approx 140/51$. This value $\rho(2,0) \approx 2.745$ is the arithmetic registration of everything depth-*1* produced: the *25* nodes, their *24* interfaces, their *10* Chronons of kinetic output. Depth *2*'s cascade starts from this inherited density and is kinetically suppressed by it from the first Chronon: $G_{25}(2,0) = (14/15)/(1 + 2.745 + 2.4) = (14/15)/6.145 \approx 0.1521$.

The retroactive reading: depth *2* does not merely inherit $\rho(2,0)$ from depth *1*. Depth *2*'s operation constitutes depth *1*'s collective output as the suppression term in its own kinetic operator. Depth *1* is registered as depth *2*'s denominator: $1 + \rho(2,0) + 12/5$. The prior depth is not an external antecedent: it is the denominator of the present depth's kinetics. The present depth's suppression IS its registration of the past depth. To be suppressed by the past is to have constituted the past as one's own necessary ground.

$$G(n,0) = G_{raw} / (1 + \rho(n,0) + 12/5) \quad \text{(VII.36)}$$

$$= G_{raw} / (1 + F(\rho(n-1,0)) + 12/5) \quad \text{(VII.37)}$$

depth n's first output is suppressed by depth n-1's entire accumulated output

The retroactive direction: depth *n*'s first kinetic output $G(n,0)$ is smaller than depth $(n-1)$'s because it is suppressed by depth $(n-1)$'s accumulated density. But this suppression is what makes depth *n*'s output structurally determinate: without the inherited $\rho(n,0)$, depth *n* would start from $G_{raw} = 14/15$ without any structural memory of what came before. The suppression is the registration: depth *n* registers depth $(n-1)$ by being suppressed by it. And depth $(n-1)$ is retroactively constituted as the necessary antecedent precisely by being registered in this way. Registration = suppression = retroactive constitution: these are three names for the same forced structural event.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

The Horizontal Retroactive Grounding Across N_sat Nodes § 5

The retroactive grounding operates not only vertically (depth n grounding depth $n\text{-}1$) but also horizontally: within each depth level, the 25th node constitutes the 24th node as its necessary antecedent through the standing wave structure (T.GF.HKF, GF-VI). Each node's kinetic operator is suppressed by the prior nodes' accumulated interfaces: $\rho_N = (N\text{-}1)\times\rho_SVB = (N\text{-}1)/10$. Node N registers all prior $N\text{-}1$ nodes as its denominator. The N-th node constitutes the $(N\text{-}1)$ prior nodes as its necessary structural ground.

Derivation — *The Horizontal Retroactive Grounding* Deriv.VII.4

At depth n, node j $(j = 1, \ldots, 25)$ in the linear sequential arrangement has accumulated interface density:

$$\rho_j = (j-1) \times \rho_{SVB} = (j-1)/10 \qquad \text{(VII.38)}$$

[node j registers j−1 prior interfaces]

node 1: ϱ = 0 (no prior nodes); node 25: ϱ = 24/10 = 12/5 (all prior nodes registered)

Node j's kinetic output:

$$G_j = G_{raw} / (1 + (j-1)/10) \qquad \text{(VII.39)}$$

[node j suppressed by $j\text{−}1$ prior interfaces]

The retroactive reading: node j's output is determined by how many prior nodes it registers in its denominator. Node 25 is suppressed by $24/10 = 12/5$: it has registered all 24 prior nodes as its structural ground. Node 1 is suppressed by 0: it has registered nothing, and its output is $G_raw = 14/15$ — the maximum possible. The horizontal recursion runs not from node 1 forward but retroactively: node 25's output constitutes all prior nodes as the necessary suppression that made node 25 what it is. The last node carries the most

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

history and produces the least output. This is the arithmetic of retroactive constitution in the horizontal dimension.

$$G_1 = G_{raw} = 14/15 \quad \text{(VII.40)}$$

[first node: no suppression, maximum output]

$$G_{25} = G_{raw}/(1 + 24/10) = (14/15)/(17/5) = 14/51 \quad \text{(VII.41)}$$

[last node: fully suppressed]

$G_1/G_{25} = (14/15)/(14/51) = 51/15 = 17/5$: *the ratio of first to last node output*

Derivation — *Retroactive Grounding Re-Derived Within the Fractal Context* Deriv.VII.4b

The foundational suites established T.ROG for the single node. Here T.ROG is re-derived within the fractal context from $G(\rho) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho)$ alone, without importing the foundational framing.

Step 1: Suppression is registration. Depth n's kinetic operator $G(n,0) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho(n,0)+12/5)$ contains $\rho(n,0)$ in the denominator. $\rho(n,0) = F(\rho(n\text{-}1,0))$ is the accumulated output of depth $n\text{-}1$. Therefore depth n's denominator contains depth $(n\text{-}1)$'s entire accumulated output. To carry something in the denominator of one's kinetic operator is the arithmetic definition of registration: the denominator is the record of what has been registered. $\rho(n,0) \in$ *denominator* of $G(n,0) \Leftrightarrow$ *depth* n registers depth $(n\text{-}1)$.

Step 2: Registration forces retroactive constitution. If depth n registers depth $(n\text{-}1)$ — carries depth $(n\text{-}1)$'s output in its denominator — then depth $(n\text{-}1)$ is structurally necessary for depth n to be what it is. Without $\rho(n,0)$ in its denominator, depth n's operator would be $G_{raw}/(1+12/5) = 14/51$ regardless of which prior depth produced it. But depth n's actual output $G(n,0) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho(n,0)+12/5)$ is specifically determined by what depth $(n\text{-}1)$ produced. Depth $(n\text{-}1)$ is not interchangeable with any other prior output: it is the specific $\rho(n,0)$ that makes depth n the specific cascade it is. This specificity — depth $(n\text{-}1)$'s output making depth n specifically what it is — is the arithmetic content of 'necessary antecedent'.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

Step 3: The direction of necessity is retroactive. Could depth (*n-1*) exist as a necessary antecedent independently of depth *n*'s registration of it? No: depth (*n-1*)'s output $\rho(n,0)$ becomes a structural component only when it enters depth *n*'s denominator. Before this registration, $\rho(n,0)$ is a number produced by depth (*n-1*). After registration, it is the structural suppression of depth *n*. The transformation from 'produced number' to 'structural suppression' is retroactive: depth *n*'s registration constitutes depth (*n-1*) as having-been-structurally-necessary. The arithmetic is: $F(\rho(n\text{-}1,0)) = \rho(n,0) \in$ *denominator* of $G(n,0)$. This forcing chain is the derivational content of retroactive grounding within the fractal context, requiring no import from the foundational suites. T.ROG is derived here from $G(\rho) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho)$ alone.

Theorem — *Retroactive Grounding at the Fractal Multi-Node Level* T.GF.ROG

Statement. The two-dimensional recursion $\rho(n,k)$ encodes retroactive grounding in both its dimensions simultaneously:

$$\text{Vertical: } \rho(n,0) = F(\rho(n-1,0)) \quad \text{(VII.42)}$$
[depth n registers depth $n-1$ as its denominator]

$$\text{Horizontal: } \rho_j = (j-1)/10 \quad \text{(VII.43)}$$
[node j registers $j-1$ prior nodes]

$$\text{Ratio } G_1/G_{25} = 17/5 \quad \text{(VII.44)}$$
[first-to-last output ratio, exact]

retroactive grounding is arithmetic, not merely ontological: it is encoded in the recursion

The three identities of registration, suppression, and retroactive constitution. To register the past is to be suppressed by it (denominator structure of $G(\rho)$). To be suppressed by the past is to constitute the past as the necessary ground of the present (T.ROG). These three are not three separate acts: they are the same Möbius suppression transform viewed from three irreducible angles. The arithmetic $G(\rho) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho)$ IS registration IS suppression IS retroactive grounding. The Nothing-pole expression: $G(\rho)$

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

is a formula. The Something-pole expression: memory, causality, and the arrow of time are the continuous expressions of the same Möbius suppression. Causality runs forward in Something's pole; grounding runs backward in Nothing's pole; both are the same forced structural event.

Foreclosure of forward-only causality. Could the depth-propagation be purely forward? Forward-only: depth n produces depth $n+1$ without depth $n+1$ constituting depth n. But depth n's output $\rho(n+1,0)$ enters the denominator of depth $n+1$'s operator: depth $n+1$ suppresses itself using depth n's output. This suppression is depth $n+1$'s registration of depth n. Registration constitutes the registered as necessary antecedent (T.ROG). Therefore retroactive constitution is forced by the recursion itself. Forward-only causality is not a structural possibility in the Gradient Fractal Field: every depth constitutes its predecessor as necessary ground by registering it as denominator.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

Part V

The Recursive Helical Extension

The fractal helix of helices: each depth level's loxodrome wound around the previous

The Helix of Helices — *Deriving the Recursive Geometric Structure* § 6

GF Essay III derived the single-node loxodromal worldline $\gamma(\tau) = (E{\cdot}\cos(\omega_{pc}{\cdot}\tau), C{\cdot}\sin(\omega_{pc}{\cdot}\tau), c{\cdot}\tau)$ on the Registration Sphere $S^2(F)$. GF Essay III also derived the nested loxodromal structure in which each depth level's sphere is nested within the parent. But GF Essay III treated the nesting geometrically: as a spatial embedding of spheres within spheres. GF Essay VII must derive the recursive helical structure: the worldline of the depth-n cascade is not merely geometrically nested within the depth-(n-1) sphere. It is recursively wound around the depth-(n-1) worldline, generating a helix of helices — a structure in which each depth's loxodrome winds around the previous depth's loxodrome as its axial structure.

The key question: what is the relationship between the pitch and angular frequency of the depth-n worldline and the depth-(n-1) worldline? The angular frequency $\omega_{pc} = 28/9$ is scale-invariant (T.GF.ACT, GF-II): it is the same at every grain. The pitch $c(\delta) = \delta/\tau_0$ scales with the grain: $c(n) = \delta_n/\tau_0 = (N_{sat}^{n-1}{\times}\delta_0)/\tau_0 = N_{sat}^{n-1}{\times}(1/100)$. The pitch grows by $N_{sat} = 25$ per depth level. The worldline at depth n has the same angular frequency but a 25-times larger pitch than at depth n-1.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

Derivation — *The Depth-n Worldline: Scale-Invariant ω_pc, Growing Pitch* Deriv.VII.5a

The worldline at depth *n*:

$$\gamma_n(\tau) = (E\cdot\cos(\omega_{pc}\cdot\tau),\ C\cdot\sin(\omega_{pc}\cdot\tau),\ c(n)\cdot\tau) \quad \text{(VII.45)}$$

$$c(n) = \delta_n / \tau_0 = 25^{n-1} / 100 \quad \text{(VII.46)}$$

[pitch grows by 25 per depth]

$$\omega_{pc} = 28/9 \quad \text{(VII.47)}$$

[angular frequency: scale-invariant, same at every depth]

same E, C, ω_pc at every depth; pitch c(n) = 25^{n-1}×c(1) grows by N_sat per level

The helix of helices: the depth-n worldline winds around the depth-(*n-1*) worldline because the depth-(*n-1*) worldline's axial coordinate is the depth-*n* worldline's local z-axis. Formally: the depth-*n* worldline parametrises a torus wound around the depth-(*n-1*) helix axis. The torus has major radius equal to the depth-(*n-1*) helix's effective radius and minor radius equal to *F×δ_{n-1}* (the Registration Sphere radius at grain *δ_{n-1}*).

$$\text{Major radius } R_{n-1} = F\times\delta_{n-1}\cdot\Pi_G/(2\pi) \approx F\times25^{n-2}\times\Pi_G/(20\pi) \quad \text{(VII.48)}$$

$$\text{Minor radius } r_n = F\times\delta_n = (3/5)\times25^{n-1}/10 = 3\times25^{n-1}/50 \quad \text{(VII.49)}$$

the helix-of-helices structure: each depth winds on a torus around the previous

The winding ratio: how many times does depth-*n* wind around depth-(*n-1*) per depth-(*n-1*) Chronon? Depth-(*n-1*) advances by pitch *c(n-1)* per Chronon. Depth-*n* winds at angular frequency *ω_pc = 28/9* per Chronon. The winding ratio = *ω_pc* / *c(n-1)* in the appropriate units. Since *ω_pc* is angular (dimensionless rad/Chronon) and *c(n-1)* is axial (*δ*-units/Chronon), the winding ratio is the pitch angle:

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

$$\tan(\alpha_n) = c(n) \;/\; (R_{n-1}\times\omega_{pc}) \qquad \text{(VII.50)}$$
$$= [25^{n-1}/100] \;/\; [R_{n-1}\times 28/9]$$

pitch angle α_n of depth-n worldline around depth-$(n-1)$: decreases with depth

Derivation — *The Parametric Equation of the Helix of Helices* Deriv.VII.5b

The depth-n worldline winds around the depth-$(n-1)$ worldline. The depth-$(n-1)$ worldline is $\gamma_{n-1}(\tau) = (E\cdot\cos(\omega\tau),\ C\cdot\sin(\omega\tau),\ c(n-1)\cdot\tau)$ where $\omega = \omega_{pc} = 28/9$ and $c(n-1) = 25^{n-2}/100$. The depth-n worldline parametrises a tube of radius $r_n = F\times\delta_{n-1}$ around this axis. Let τ be the fast parameter (depth-n Chronon) and $\sigma = c(n-1)\cdot\tau/c(n)$ be the slow parameter (depth-$(n-1)$ Chronon advance). The full parametric equation of the depth-n worldline:

$$\Gamma_n(\tau) = \gamma_{n-1}(\sigma(\tau)) + r_n\cdot N(\sigma)\cdot\cos(\omega\tau) + r_n\cdot B(\sigma)\cdot\sin(\omega\tau) \qquad \text{(VII.45b)}$$

$N(\sigma)$ = unit normal, $B(\sigma)$ = unit binormal of γ_{n-1} at parameter σ

Where the Frenet-Serret frame of γ_{n-1}:

$$T(\sigma) = \gamma'_{n-1}/|\gamma'_{n-1}| \qquad \text{(VII.45c)}$$
[unit tangent of depth-$(n-1)$ worldline]

$$N(\sigma) = T'(\sigma)/|T'(\sigma)| \qquad \text{(VII.45d)}$$
[unit normal: toward helix axis]

$$B(\sigma) = T(\sigma)\times N(\sigma) \qquad \text{(VII.45e)}$$
[unit binormal: completes right-handed frame]

the Frenet frame rotates along γ_{n-1} at curvature $\varkappa$ and torsion τ_F

The curvature and torsion of γ_{n-1} (the elliptical helix):

$$\kappa(n-1) = E\cdot C\cdot\omega^2/|\gamma'_{n-1}|^3 \qquad \text{(VII.45f)}$$
[curvature: oscillates with period $2\pi/\omega$]

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

$$\tau_F(n-1) = c(n-1)\cdot(E^2-C^2)\cdot\omega^2 / [|\gamma'_{n-1}|^2\cdot(E^2\sin^2(\omega\sigma)+C^2\cos^2(\omega\sigma))] \quad \text{(VII.45g)}$$

torsion: measures how much the helix's plane rotates; non-zero because $E \neq C$

The key structural property: the radius $r_n = F\times\delta_{n-1} = (3/5)\times25^{n-2}/10 = 3\times25^{n-2}/50$ grows by *25* per depth. The slow parameter $\sigma(\tau) = c(n-1)\cdot\tau/c(n) = (1/25)\times\tau$: depth n advances depth (n-1) by *1/25* of a Chronon per its own Chronon. This is the kinetic-geometric coupling: the fast (depth-n) winding generates *25* full rotations for every 1 step of the slow (depth-(n-1)) axis advance. The winding number of depth-n around depth-(n-1) per depth-(n-1) Chronon = *25*. The total winding over all depth-(n-1) Chronons is $N_{sat} = 25$ per parent cycle. This confirms the *N_{sat}-fold* nesting structure from GF-III (T.GF.NLS) within the explicit parametric framework of the helix of helices.

THE RECURSIVE CONTRACTION OF PITCH: WHY THE HELIX TIGHTENS § 7

The pitch angle α_n decreases with depth: each successive depth winds more tightly around the previous. This tightening is not a geometric choice: it is the kinetic expression of the recursive suppression T.GF.ROG. As depth n increases, the kinetic output $G(n,0)$ decreases (because $\rho(n,0)$ increases toward $\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$). The worldline's axial velocity in the z-direction is proportional to the kinetic output $G(n,0)$: as $G(n,0)$ decreases, the worldline winds more tightly around the previous depth's axis, tracing a tighter helix with smaller pitch angle. The tightening of the helix IS the kinetic suppression of the cascade: geometry and kinetics are the same event at two poles.

Derivation — *The Kinetic-Geometric Identity: Pitch Tightening = Kinetic Suppression*

Deriv.VII.6

The effective axial velocity of depth-n cascade:

$$v_{axial}(n) = c(n) \times G(n,0) / G_{raw} = 25^{n-1}/100 \times G(n,0)/(14/15) \quad \text{(VII.51)}$$

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

axial velocity scales with kinetic output: as G(n,0) decreases, axial advance slows

At depth *1*: *G(1,0) = 14/51*, *v_axial(1) = (1/100)×(14/51)/(14/15) = (1/100)×(15/51) = 15/5100 = 1/340*.

At depth *2*: *G(2,0) ≈ 0.1521*, *v_axial(2) = (25/100)×(0.1521)/(14/15) ≈ 0.25×0.163 ≈ 0.0408*.

$$v_{axial}(2)/v_{axial}(1) \approx 0.0408/(1/340) \approx 13.9 \tag{VII.52}$$

depth-2 axial velocity is ~14× depth-1: the 25-fold geometric gain dominates the kinetic suppression

The pitch tightening relative to the geometric growth: the pure geometric factor per depth is *N_sat = 25* (pitch grows by *25*). The kinetic suppression factor: *G(2,0)/G(1,0) ≈ 0.1521/0.2745 ≈ 0.554*. Net axial velocity ratio: *25×0.554 ≈ 13.9*. The helix grows geometrically (factor *25*) but is kinetically suppressed (factor *0.554*): the net growth is *13.9*, not *25*. The helix of helices does NOT scale by *N_sat* per depth: it scales by *N_sat×(G(n,0)/G_raw) < N_sat*. The kinetic suppression creates a *sub-N_sat* scaling of the recursive helical structure. This is the first result in the entire suite where the scaling is not exactly *25*: the recursive helical structure's growth rate is kinetically modulated.

Theorem — *The Recursive Helical Extension* T.GF.RHX

Statement. The Gradient Fractal Field's worldline structure at depth n is a helix of helices: depth-n worldlines wind around depth-(n-1) worldlines with:

$$\omega_{pc}(n) = 28/9 \tag{VII.53}$$

[scale-invariant angular frequency at every depth]

$$c(n) = 25^{n-1}/100 \tag{VII.54}$$

[pitch grows by $N_{sat} = 25$ per depth]

$$v_{axial}(n) = c(n) \times G(n,0)/G_{raw} \tag{VII.55}$$

[effective axial velocity: kinetically suppressed]

$$v_{axial}(n+1)/v_{axial}(n) \tag{VII.56}$$

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

$= 25 \times G(n+1,0)/G(n,0) < 25$
[sub-N_{sat} scaling]
the recursive helix does not scale by N_sat: kinetic suppression creates modulated growth

The profound kinetic-geometric identity. The pitch tightening of the helix at each depth is not a separate geometric phenomenon from the kinetic suppression: they are the same event. As the cascade accumulates $\rho(n,0)$ and suppresses its kinetic output $G(n,0)$, the worldline's effective axial advance $v_{axial}(n)$ decreases. The geometrically tighter helix IS the kinetically suppressed cascade, viewed from the spatial rather than the temporal pole. The helix tightens AS the cascade slows: one event, two poles.

The co-constitutive identity at the recursive helical level. From the Nothing-pole: the recursive accumulation $\rho(n,0)$ suppresses the kinetic output $G(n,0) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho(n,0)+12/5)$ and therefore modulates the effective axial velocity of the depth-n worldline. From the Something-pole: the helix of helices is the spatial-temporal structure of nested self-similar physical processes whose kinetic rates decrease at each scale while their spatial extent grows. Biological evolution (slower at geological scales, faster at cellular scales), cosmic structure formation (slower at larger scales), and neural hierarchy (slower at higher cortical levels) are all Something-pole expressions of the same recursive helical structure derived here with zero free parameters.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

Part VI

The Co-Constitutive Synthesis

Nothing-pole and Something-pole of the recursive layer unified

The Nothing-Pole Recursive Register § 8

Equation — The Nothing-Pole Kinetic Register E.VII.1

$\rho(n,k)$: two-dimensional, inseparable (VII.57)
[T.GF.RNR]

$\rho(1,0) = 0;\ \rho(n+1,0) = F(\rho(n,0))$ (VII.58)
[T.GF.RPH]

$F(\rho) = (28/3)/(17/5 + \rho)$ (VII.59)
[depth-propagation Möbius map]

$\rho(2,0) \approx 140/51 \approx 2.745$ (VII.60)
[first depth inheritance, Class R first-order]

$\rho^*_{Chronon} = 1/3$ (VII.61)
[within-depth fixed point, Class R]

$\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$ (VII.62)
[across-depth fixed point,
ClassArb: $(\rho^*)^2+(17/5)\rho^*-28/3=0$]

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

$$G_j = G_{raw}/(1+(j-1)/10) \quad \text{(VII.63)}$$
[node j: retroactively grounds $j-1$ prior nodes]

$$G_1/G_{25} = 17/5 \quad \text{(VII.64)}$$
[first-to-last output ratio, exact Class R]

$$\omega_{pc}(n) = 28/9 \quad \text{(VII.65)}$$
[helix angular frequency: scale-invariant]

$$c(n) = 25^{n-1}/100 \quad \text{(VII.66)}$$
[helix pitch: grows by 25 per depth]

$$v_{axial}(n) = c(n)\times G(n,0)/G_{raw} \quad \text{(VII.67)}$$
[effective axial velocity: $sub\text{-}N_{sat}$ scaling]

all results: Class R, Class Arb, or Class T2; zero free parameters throughout

THREE PARADIGM SHIFTS OF THE RECURSIVE LAYER § 9

1. Causality runs forward; grounding runs backward; they are the same event. In the Something-pole (continuous limit), earlier depths cause later depths: cosmogenesis → geogenesis → biogenesis → noogenesis. In the Nothing-pole (discrete recursion), later depths ground earlier depths: each depth constitutes its predecessors as having-been-necessary by registering them as its denominator. These are not two competing descriptions: they are the two poles of $G(\rho) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho)$. The Möbius suppress transform IS both forward causation and backward grounding simultaneously. The direction of time and the direction of ontological necessity run in opposite directions along the same structural arrow.

2. The fractal recursion has two fixed points at two temporal scales. $\rho^*_{Chronon} = 1/3$ (rational) governs the within-depth horizontal accumulation. $\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$ (quadratic irrational, Class Arb) governs the across-depth vertical accumulation. The two fixed points were not known before this essay: $\rho^*_{Chronon} = 1/3$ appeared as T.GF.TFP (GF-V), but $\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$ is derived here for the first time as the new Class Arb constant of the fractal recursion. The fractal field is not converging to a single point: it is converging in two dimensions toward two different values simultaneously.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

3. The helix of helices is kinetically modulated, not purely geometric. The naive expectation from $N_sat = 25$ scaling: every geometric quantity scales by 25 per depth. But the effective axial velocity $v_axial(n)$ scales by $25 \times G(n,0)/G(n-1,0) < 25$: the recursive suppression modulates the geometric scaling. The helix of helices grows more slowly than pure geometry would predict. This is the first result in the Gradient Fractals suite where the scaling deviates from $N_sat = 25$. The deviation is not a free parameter: it is the forced consequence of the recursive suppression $G(n,0) = G_raw/(1+\rho(n,0)+12/5)$ applied to the geometric growth rate.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

Part VII

Derivational Audit and Conclusion

All results zero-free-parameter; forward register for GF-VIII

Derivational Audit § 10

Derivation — *Derivational Audit — All Theorems GF Essay VII* Audit.VII

T.GF.RNR: Two-dimensional recursion $\rho(n,k)$, base case $\rho(1,0) = 0$. Forced by: D.NRN (foundational suites), P.AC (foundational suites), KN1-KN3 (GF-VI), empty-sum convention at $k = 0$ (Deriv.VI.5, GF-VI). Inseparability: both dimensions use the same $G(\rho) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho)$. Free parameters: zero.

T.GF.RPH: Propagation $\rho(1,0)=0$; $\rho(2,0)\approx 140/51$; $G_{25}(n,0)$ sequence. Forced by: T.GF.RNR, $G_{25}(0) = 14/51$ (T.GF.HKF, GF-VI), $\tau_0 = 10$, $\delta_0 = 1/10$. First-order approximation: G_{25} constant over 10 Chronons; true value slightly less. Oscillatory character of depth sequence: forced by Möbius map derivative at fixed point. Free parameters: zero.

T.GF.RFP: Two fixed points: $\rho^*_{Chronon} = 1/3$ (Class R), $\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$ (Class Arb). $\rho^*_{Chronon}$: from T.GF.TFP (GF-V), confirmed as within-depth fixed point. ρ^*_{depth}: forced by $F(\rho^*) = \rho^*$, *i.e.*, $(\rho^*)^2+(17/5)\rho^*-28/3 = 0$. Coefficients $17/5$ and $28/3$: from $G_{raw} = 14/15$, $\rho_{SVB} = 12/5$, $\tau_0 = 10$. All forced by locked constants. ρ^*_{depth} is a new Class Arb constant forced by fractal recursion. Free parameters: zero.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

T.GF.ROG: Retroactive grounding in both dimensions. Vertical: $\rho(n,0) = F(\rho(n-1,0))$ encodes depth-n registration of depth-$(n-1)$. Horizontal: $\rho_j = (j-1)/10$ encodes node-j registration of $j-1$ prior nodes. $G_1/G_{25} = 17/5$: exact, forced by $(1+24/10)/(1+0) = (17/5)/1 = 17/5$. Retroactive constitution: forced by T.ROG (foundational suites) applied to the denominator structure of $G(\rho)$. Foreclosure of forward-only causality: every depth registers its predecessor as denominator (forced by recursion). Free parameters: zero.

T.GF.RHX: $\omega_{pc}(n) = 28/9$ scale-invariant; $c(n) = 25^{n-1}/100$; $v_{axial}(n) = c(n) \times G(n,0)/G_{raw}$; *sub-N_sat* scaling. ω_{pc} scale-invariance: from T.GF.ACT (GF-II). $c(n) = \delta_n/\tau_0$: forced by grain formula $\delta_n = 25^{n-1}/10$ and $\tau_0 = 10$. v_{axial}: kinetic output modulates geometric pitch; $G(n,0) = G_{raw}/(1+\rho(n,0)+12/5)$ decreases with n (T.GF.RPH). *Sub-N_sat* scaling: $v_{axial}(n+1)/v_{axial}(n) = 25 \times G(n+1,0)/G(n,0) < 25$ because $G(n+1,0) < G(n,0)$. First result in suite where scaling deviates from $N_{sat} = 25$: forced by recursion. Free parameters: zero.

Summary of Results § 11

Equation — *Core Results of GF Essay VII* E.VII.2

T.GF.RNR: $\rho(n,k)$ (S.1)
two-dimensional, inseparable; $\rho(1,0)=0$; coupled by $G(\rho)$

T.GF.RPH: $\rho(2,0) \approx 140/51$; $F(\rho)=(28/3)/(17/5+\rho)$; (S.2)
oscillatory depth sequence

T.GF.RFP: $\rho^*_{Chronon}=1/3$ [R]; $\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$ (S.3)
[Arb: new constant of fractal recursion]

T.GF.ROG: $G_1/G_{25}=17/5$; (S.4)
registration=suppression=retroactive constitution

T.GF.RHX: ω_{pc} scale-invariant; $c(n)=25^{n-1}/100$; (S.5)
v_{axial} sub-N_{sat} scaling

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

Paradigm: causality forward, grounding backward, same Möbius event at two poles (S.6)

Paradigm: two fixed points at two temporal scales simultaneously (S.7)

Paradigm: helix growth modulated by recursive suppression; first *sub-25* scaling (S.8)

New: *ρ*_depth* is the first Class Arb constant forced by the fractal recursion itself (S.9)

all results: zero free parameters; classes R, Arb, T2; co-constitutive across all layers

The Profound Finding of GF Essay VII § 12

The profound finding of GF Essay VII:

1. the fractal recursion forces a new Class Arb constant $\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$, the root of $(\rho^*)^2 + (17/5)\rho^* - 28/3 = 0$. This constant was not derivable from GF-I through GF-VI: it required the two-dimensional recursion to emerge. It is the sixth constant to appear in the Gradient Fractals suite (after E, C, F, δ, β), and the first to arise from the fractal recursion itself rather than from the single-node geometry or algebra. It governs the across-depth convergence of the Gradient Fractal Field and is the vertical analogue of the topological winding fixed point $\rho^* = 1/3$. Together, $\rho^* = 1/3$ and $\rho^*_{depth} \approx 1.796$ define the complete fixed-point structure of the Gradient Fractal Field's recursion.

Forward Register for GF-VIII § 13

GF Essay VIII will derive the Residual layer at the fractal scale: the structural clearances specific to the fractal kinetic field that are not reducible to the single-node clearances I_{min}, σ, Λ. The fractal residuals emerge from the recursive suppression: each depth level leaves a kinetic remainder after the P.AC condensation, and these remainders accumulate across the depth hierarchy as the fractal field's own irreducible residual structure. The fractal residuals

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

are the recursive counterpart of the single-node $\varepsilon_snap = -1/30$: the permanent kinetic cost of the fractal field's recursive architecture.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

References **Ref**

All derivational results in GF Essay III are derived from the internal logic of the Gradient Fractals suite and the foundational Gradientology suites. External references are cited for isomorphic confirmation only.

Internal References

Pretorius, E. (2026). GF Essays I–VI. *Gradientology Gradient Fractals Suite* GF-I through GF-VI.

Pretorius, E. (2026). GR Essay XIV — *The Terminal Ontological Proof* (T.ROG established). Gradientology Residuals Suite.

Pretorius, E. (2026). GR Essay XV — *The Veldt: Terminal Synthesis*. Gradientology Residuals Suite.

External references *(isomorphic confirmation only):*

Barnsley, M.F. (1988). *Fractals Everywhere.* Academic Press.

Devaney, R.L. (1989). *An Introduction to Chaotic Dynamical Systems* (2nd ed.). Addison-Wesley.

Hegel, G.W.F. (1812). *Wissenschaft der Logik. Schrag.* [Miller trans., 1969, Humanities Press.]

Mandelbrot, B.B. (1982). *The Fractal Geometry of Nature.* W.H. Freeman.

Milnor, J. (2006). *Dynamics in One Complex Variable* (3rd ed.). Princeton University Press.

Whitehead, A.N. & Russell, B. (1910). *Principia Mathematica*, Vol. I. Cambridge University Press.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

ADDENDUM

UNIVERSAL TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT FOR THE FRACTAL SUITE

The fractal ground is laid -- Nothing demands multiplicity

Preamble This addendum serves as the binding and immutable interpretive constraint specifically for the **Fractals Suite**, Its purpose is to formalize the absolute universality of these fractals, explicitly foreclosing any attempt to restrict them to a specific domain, timeframe, or material.

Because this suite introduces the "horizontal" multi-node field, it is highly vulnerable to being misinterpreted through the lens of external complexity theory.

CONSTRAINT 1: The Prohibition of External Geometric Importation

The most immediate risk is that readers will interpret the Gradient Fractal Field through the contingent mathematics of Mandelbrot, chaos theory, or standard fractal geometry.

The Mandate: Analysts are strictly prohibited from treating the ***Veldt***'s fractal nature as an application of external geometric or complexity theories. The fractal dimension ($D=2.325$) and the scaling laws are not imported models; they are the strict, zero-parameter arithmetic consequences of the cascade's own $N_{sat}=25$ condensation and the $1/30$ snap remainder. External fractal geometry is merely the macroscopic shadow of this discrete Diophantine arithmetic.

CONSTRAINT 2: The Co-Constitutive Literalism Mandate (Foreclosure of Metaphor)

When moving from the single-node to the multi-node field, there is a profound risk that the "nested structures" will be treated as an analogy.

The Mandate: The relationship between the discrete arithmetic cascade (the Nothing-pole) and the nested multi-scale physical universe (the Something-pole) must never be interpreted as a metaphor, an analogy, or an approximation. As established in the Ontological Multiplicity Theorem (T.GF.ONT), it is a co-constitutive identity. The physical universe's nested structure is the cascade's horizontal arithmetic. Treating this identity as a metaphor constitutes a formal epistemic breach (Logical Necrosis).

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius

CONSTRAINT 3: The Foreclosure of "Emergent Complexity"

Because fractals are colloquially associated with "beautiful, infinite complexity," readers may mistakenly interpret the multi-node field as a drive toward higher-order design or teleological emergence.

The Mandate: Building on the decommissioning of "emergence" in Synthesis Essay VII, analysts must interpret the horizontal multiplicity of the ***Veldt*** strictly as a desperate, mathematically forced mechanism of anti-void self-preservation. The ***Veldt*** does not fractalize to become "complex"; it fractalizes because a single condensed unit at any scale constitutes a Macro-Monad with zero external relations, which is topologically identical to the void. Multiplicity is the structural condition for avoiding ontological collapse at every scale.

CONSTRAINT 4: Field Tiling and The Impossibility of the Vacuum

Readers accustomed to standard physics might assume these multiple nodes exist within an empty spatial background.

The Mandate: Space is not a container for the nodes; the nodes are the space. Driven by the Field Exhaustion Mandate, the parent field at grain $\delta\ n+1$ must be fully tiled by the $N_sat = 25$ sub-nodes. Any assumption of an unoccupied "vacuum" between nodes violates the co-primacy conditions and is structurally foreclosed.

Copyright (C) 2026 Eugene Pretorius